

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-14, 16-33, 35-49, 51-67, 69-71 are pending.

I. STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy of a telephone interview held on June 28, 2010. The Examiner and representatives for the Applicants discussed aspects of the current Office Action and the amended claims. Applicants' representatives discussed the operation of the systems described in Kumhyr, White, and Wood and how that system differs from the pending Claims. In particular, the parties focused the recitations in the current claims for using different quality criteria for each user role. Applicants pointed out that even if Kumhyr recites the use of password quality criteria, Wood recites passwords tied to trust levels, and White recites passwords tied to user roles, none of them hint at using different quality criteria, related to password strength, for each user role. Applicant's representatives and the Examiner seemed to both appreciate how the prior art systems operate and discussed how the present amendments to the claims distinguish the claims over the cited references.

II. CLAIMS 1-12, 16-31, 35-47, 51-66 AND 69-71—KUMHYR, WOOD, WHITE

Claims 1-12, 16-31, 35-47, 51-66 and 69-71 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2004/0250139 A1 ("Kumhyr") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,944,761 ("Wood") in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,826,692 ("White"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A. Claim 1

Claim 1 features a method of dynamically mitigating a noncompliant password and recites, with emphasis added:

obtaining a password from a user when the user attempts to access a service;

determining whether the password meets quality criteria; and

if the password meets the quality criteria, granting to the user a first level of access to the service, wherein the granting of the first level of access to the service is dependant on the password exceeding a quality criteria threshold;

if the password does not meet the quality criteria, granting to the user a different level of access to the service than if the password meets the quality criteria;
wherein the user is associated with a particular user role, of a plurality of user roles, and wherein determining whether the password meets quality criteria comprises determining whether the password meets quality criteria for the particular user role and wherein a different quality criteria is associated with each user role in the plurality of user roles;
wherein the quality criteria is based, at least in part, on the strength of the password;
wherein the method is performed by one or more computing devices.

The Office Action states that the combination of Kumhyr, White, and Wood recite the above emphasized feature and cites Kumhyr for disclosing “determining whether the password meets quality criteria” (Office Action, Page 4, Line 6), Wood for disclosing “different trust levels based on authentication information (passwords)” (Office Action, Page 4, Lines 13-14), and White for disclosing “a password [that] is associated with a user role”. However, the combination of Kumhyr, Wood, and White would merely check password criteria while offering trust levels and user roles tied to different **passwords** rather than different **password quality criteria**. None of references hint at using different quality criteria, related to password strength, for each user role. Therefore, Kumhyr, Wood, and White do not teach or suggest the feature of “determining whether the password meets quality criteria for the particular user role and wherein a different quality criteria is associated with each user role in the plurality of user roles,” as claimed.

B. Claims 2-12, 16-31, 35-47, 51-66 and 69-71

Claims 19, 20, 36, and 54 are independent claims which recite limitations which are substantially similar to independent Claim 1. Specifically, each of the foregoing independent claims recites using different quality criteria for each user role. Therefore, Claims 19, 20, 36, and 54 are allowable for at least the same reasons mentioned above with respect to independent Claim 1.

Claims 2-12, 16-18, 21-31, 35, 37-47, 51-53, 55-66 and 69-71 are dependent claims which depend on Claims 1, 19, 20, 36, and 54. Since dependent claims contain all the limitations of the claim from which they depend, Claims 2-12, 16-18, 21-31, 35, 37-47, 51-53, 55-66 and 69-71 are allowable for at least the same reasons as independent Claims 1, 19, 20, 36, and 54.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1-12, 16-31, 35-47, 51-66 and 69-71 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

C. Claims 13, 32, 48 and 66

Claims 13, 32, 48 and 66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Kumhyr in view of Wood in further view of White in further view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0250139 A1 ("Hurley"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 13, 32, 48 and 66 are the dependent claims of independent Claims 1, 20, 36, and 54 respectively. Since each dependent claim includes all the limitations of the claim from which they depend, Claims 13, 32, 48, and 66 are allowable for at least the same reasons mentioned above with respect to independent Claims 1, 20, 36, and 54.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of Claims 13, 32, 48, and 66 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

D. Claims 14, 33, and 67

Claims 14, 33 and 67 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Kumhyr in view of Wood in further view of White in further view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0250141 A1 ("Casco-Arias"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 14, 33, and 67 are the dependent claims of independent Claims 1, 20, and 54 respectively. Since each dependent claim includes all the limitations of the claim from which they depend, Claims 14, 33, and 67 are allowable for at least the same reasons mentioned above with respect to independent Claims 1, 32, and 66.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of Claims 14, 33, and 67 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

II. CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, the issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is believed next in order, and that action is most earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages or credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

Hickman Palermo Truong & Becker LLP

Dated: June 28, 2010

/ChristopherJPalermo#42056/

Christopher J. Palermo

Reg. No. 42,056

Attorneys for Applicants

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, California 95110-1083
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1225
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076